



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,687	01/31/2006	Roy G Gordon	42697,149 US3	7410
23483	7590	06/09/2008		
WILMERHALE/BOSTON			EXAMINER	
60 STATE STREET			WIECZOREK, MICHAEL P	
BOSTON, MA 02109				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		4172		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/09/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com

teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com

sharon.mathews@wilmerhale.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/534,687

Applicant(s)

GORDON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Wiczorek

Art Unit

4172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-2, 7-13, drawn to a process for forming a thin film comprising a metal.

Group II, claim(s) 3-4, 7-13, drawn to a process for forming a metal nitride thin film.

Group III, claim(s) 5-13, drawn to a process for forming a metal oxide thin film.

Group IV, claims 14-15, 40-41, drawn to a volatile metal(I) amidinate composition.

Group V, claims 16-17, 42-43, drawn to a volatile metal(II) bis(amidinate) composition.

Group VI, claims 18-19, 44-45, drawn to a volatile metal(III) tris(amidinate) composition.

Group VII, claims 20-39, drawn to a process for forming a thin film comprising a transition metal or lanthanide metal.

Lack of Unity

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the special technical feature which is referred to Annex B of Appendix A1 of the MPEP (Administrative Instructions under the PCT, "Unity of

Invention”). The express “special technical features” is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.”(Rule 13.2). Unity exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding claimed special technical features. In this case, the technical feature shared by each invention is a metal amidinate compound.

The question of unity of invention has been reconsidered retroactively by the examiner in view of the search performed; a review of Flores et al (U.S. Patent # 5,502,128) makes clear that the inventions of the groups I-VII lack the same or corresponding special technical feature because the cited reference(s) appear to demonstrate that the claimed technical feature, metal amidinate compound, does not define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Accordingly, the prior art of the record supports restriction of the claimed subject matter in to the groups as mentioned immediately above.

Election of Species

3. Lack of unity of species may be directly evident “a priori,” that is, before considering the claims in relation to any prior art, for example, independent claims to A + X, A + Y, X + Y can be said to lack unity a priori as there is no subject matter common to all claims.
4. In the event that one of Groups I-III, VII is selected these groups contain claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: a metal(I) amidinate compound, a metal(II) amidinate compound, and a metal(III) tris(amidinate).

Since there is no subject matter common to all species, the election of species is proper for the reasons set forth above where lack of unity of species is evident “a priori”.

5. In the event that Group VII is selected this group contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the thin film comprises metal nitride (claim 23) and the thin film comprises metal oxide (claim 26).

Since there is no subject matter common to all species, the election of species is proper for the reasons set forth above where lack of unity of species is evident “a priori”.

6. In the event that one of Groups IV-VI is selected these groups contain claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: R^n represents an unsubstituted alkyl group and R^n represents an alkyl group substituted with fluorine or other non-metal atoms.

Since there is no subject matter common to all species, the election of species is proper for the reasons set forth above where lack of unity of species is evident “a priori”.

7. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-7, 14-22 are generic.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including

any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Conclusion

No claims were allowed

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Wieczorek whose telephone number is (571)270-5341. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday; 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on (571)272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MPW/

/Michael Wieczorek/
Examiner, Art Unit 4172
May 29, 2008

/Vickie Kim/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4172